UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,640	09/15/2003	Hideya Kawahara	SUN04-0196-JLM	1906

57960 7590 05/15/2007

SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC.
C/O PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95618-7759

EXAMINER	
MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,640	KAWAHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sajeda Muhebbullah	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 February 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-15,17-27 and 29-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-15,17-27 and 29-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 2/20/2007.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-27, and 29-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are independent claims. Claims 1, 5-6, 13, 17-18, 25, 29-30, and 37 have been amended and claims 38-40 have been added. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 13, 18, 20-21, 25, 30, 32-33 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller (US 6,597,358).

As per claim 1, Miller teaches a method for manipulating a window within a three-dimensional (3D) display model, comprising:

displaying a view into the 3D display model through a two-dimensional (2D) display (col.5, lines 1-18);

receiving a command to manipulate the window within the 3D display model, wherein the window provides a 2D user interface for a 2D application (col.6, lines 13-36); and

in response to the command, manipulating the window within the 3D display model so that the manipulation is visible within the 2D display (col.6, lines 13-36);

wherein manipulating the window involves rotating the window around at least one of a horizontal or vertical axis so that the window's contents remain visible while the window occupies less space (col.6, lines 37-52, col.7, lines 9-12).

As per claim 6, Miller teaches the method wherein the backside of the window can accept user input, including change settings, parameters, properties and/or notes (col.7, lines 40-45).

As per claim 8, Miller teaches the method further comprising: receiving a predefined gesture through a pointing device (col.6, lines 58-61), and in response to the predefined gesture, minimizing a top-level window in the 2D display, whereby repeating the predefined gesture causes subsequent top-level windows to be minimized (col.6, lines 66-67; col.7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 9, Miller teaches the method wherein upon receiving a window restoration command, the method further comprises restoring minimized windows to their expanded state (col.6, lines 58-65).

Claims 13, 25, and 37 are similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 30 are similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 32 are similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 33 are similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, Miller teaches the method wherein if the command rotates the window so that the backside of the window is visible (col.6, lines 37-52), the method further comprises

displaying information associated with the 2D application on the backside of the window (col.7, lines 40-45).

Claims 39-40 are individually similar in scope to claim 38, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3, 7, 10-11, 14-15, 19, 22-23, 26-27, 31 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 6,597,358) in view of Horvitz et al. ("Horvitz", US 5,880,733).

As per claim 2, Miller teaches the manipulation of the window within the 3D display model (Miller, col.6, lines 13-36). However, Miller does not teach the method wherein if the command moves the window in close proximity to an edge of the 2D display, the method further comprises tilting the window so that the window appears at an oblique angle in the 2D display, whereby the contents of the window remain visible, while the window occupies less space in the 2D display and is less likely to overlap other windows. Horvitz teaches a method of displaying windows in a 2D display wherein a window may be moved to the edge of the display and appear at an oblique angle (Horvitz, col.16, lines 20-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Horvitz's teaching with Miller's method in order to make the workspace less cluttered.

As per claim 3, the method of Miller and Horvitz further teaches the method wherein if the window is selected, the method further comprises untilting the window so that the window is parallel with the 2D display (Horvitz, col.16, lines 34-41).

As per claim 7, Miller teaches the method wherein a window is displayed in a 2D display (Miller, Fig.6) and wherein the operations of turning and moving the window are animated as a continuous motion (Miller, col.6, lines 49-52). However, Miller does not teach the method wherein if the command is to minimize the window, manipulating the window involves: tilting the window so that a spine located on a side edge of the window is visible and the contents of the window remains visible, wherein the spine contains identification information for the window; and moving the minimized window to an edge of the 2D display. Horvitz teaches a method of manipulating windows wherein the spine of the window is visible and the contents of the window remain visible when the window is tilted (Horvitz, Fig.3), wherein the spine contains identification information (Horvitz, Fig.3, col.12, lines 1-14); and moving the minimized window to an edge of the 2D display (Horvitz, col.12, lines 51-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Horvitz's teaching with Miller's method in order to assist the user in locating windows.

As per claim 10, Miller teaches the dragging of windows (Miller, col.6, lines 53-57). However, Miller does not teach the method wherein if the command is entered through a pointing device and the command throws the window by moving the window quickly and releasing it, the method further comprises throwing the window by moving the window in a continuous animated motion. Horvitz teaches a method of moving windows by quick release in animated motion (col.15, lines 28-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to include Horvitz's teaching with Miller's method in order to provide ease of movement of windows.

As per claim 11, the method of Miller and Horvitz teaches the method wherein throwing the window can involve: locating the window farther from the viewpoint; scaling down the size of the window; iconizing the window; and deleting the window (Horvitz, col.15, lines 55-67).

Claims 14 and 26 are similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15 and 27 are similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 19 and 31 are similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 22 and 34 are similar in scope to claim 10, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23 and 35 are similar in scope to claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 5, 17 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 6,597,358) in view of Kreitman et al. ("Kreitman", US 5,303,388).

As per claim 5, Miller teaches the method wherein additional information associated with the 2D application is displayed. However, Miller does not explicitly teach the method wherein the information includes at least one of: application version information; application settings; application parameters; application properties; and notes associated with a file or a web page that is displayed in the window. Kreitman teaches a method of rotating and displaying a window

wherein information displayed on the backside of the application includes application properties (Kreitman, col.4, lines 14-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Kreitman's teaching with Miller's method in order to provide additional information about an application using less workspace.

Claims 17 and 29 are similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 12, 24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 6,597,358) in view of Robbins (US 6,326,978).

As per claim 12, Miller teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a command is received to manipulate a window (Miller, col.6, lines 13-36). However, Miller does not teach wherein receiving the command involves: rotating the window so that window controls on the edge of the window become visible in response to a cursor moving close to an edge of a window; receiving the command through a window control; and rotating the window back to its original orientation. Robbins teaches a method of rotating windows wherein the window controls on the edge of the window become visible in response to a cursor moving close to an edge of a window (Robbins, col.4, lines 1-4); receiving the command through a window control (Robbins, col.3, lines 46-52); and rotating the window back to its original orientation (Robbins, col.3, lines 57-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Robbins' teaching with Miller's method in order to provide greater interface flexibility.

Claims 24 and 36 are similar in scope to claim 12, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the following:

a) Neither Miller nor Horvitz, discloses freely rotating the application windows within the 3D space.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a), Firstly, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "freely rotating the application windows within the 3D space") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Secondly, Miller does teach the free rotation of windows within the 3D space (col.6, lines 41-57).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4065**. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100